

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 4, and 11 are amended. The revisions to claims 1 and 4 are supported, for example, at Figure 15 and at page 40, lines 12 through page 41, line 8 in the specification. Claims 19-27 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1-11 are pending, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim.

The claims have been objected to by the Examiner. Applicant has amended the claims 1 and 4 editorially, and, therefore, requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,497,105 (Uemura). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a solid electrolytic capacitor. A base sheet member made of resin and has an obverse surface for mounting the capacitor element and a reverse surface opposite to the obverse surface. A conductive outer cathode layer electrically connected to the cathode of the capacitor element, the outer cathode layer being spaced from the cathode of the capacitor element with the base sheet member positioned therebetween.

Uemura does not teach or suggest at least these features. Uemura is directed to a method of manufacturing solid electrolyte chip capacitors. The element of Uemura that the Examiner equates with the base sheet member of the present invention is a metal strip 22. Therefore, Uemura does not teach or suggest a base sheet member that is made of resin as currently recited in claim 1. Moreover, element 32 of Uemura, which the Examiner equates to an outer cathode layer of the present invention, is simply a raised portion of the metal strip 22 and is not spaced apart from a cathode element with a resin base sheet member position therebetween. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the features of claim 1, and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Uemura in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,814,946 (Su). Claim 10 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Uemura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,390,074 (Hasegawa). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 6 and 10 both depend from claim 1, which is believed allowable for the reasons stated above. Neither Su nor Hasegawa remedy the deficiencies of Uemura with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that each of claims 6 and 10 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Applicant does not concede the correctness of these rejections.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

23
Date: May 21, 2003



Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH:DTL